

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

**United States Patent and Trademark Office** Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

09/778,973

02/06/01

**GOEDEL** 

J 12570.1USC1

023552 PM82/0605

MERCHANT & GOULD P 0 BOX 2903

MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402-0903

SWINEHART, E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

**EXAMINER** 

3617

DATE MAILED:

06/05/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 

		1
•	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Group Art Unit
—The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover she	et beneath the correspondence address
Period for Reply	2	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	T TO EXPIRE 5	MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE
<ul> <li>Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 Cl from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days,</li> <li>If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by define the reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by set</li> </ul>	a reply within the statutory mault, expire SIX (6) MONTHS	ninimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  from the mailing date of this communication
Status		
☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on		
☐ This action is FINAL.		
<ul> <li>Since this application is in condition for allowance exc accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle,</li> </ul>		
Disposition of Claims		
Claim(s) 22-29		is/are pending in the application.
Of the above claim(s)		is/are withdrawn from consideration.
☐ Claim(s)		is/are allowed.
X Claim(s) 22-29	.,,	is/are rejected.
☐ Claim(s)		is/are objected to.
Claim(s) 22-29  Claim(s) 22-29  Claim(s) 22-29		is/are objected to.  are subject to restriction or election requirement.
·		is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement.
Application Papers  ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draftsperson's P	wing Review, PTO-948.	ioquiiome.
Application Papers  ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drac ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	wing Review, PTO-948. is □ approve	ed □ disapproved.
Application Papers  See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drag The proposed drawing correction, filed onis/are ob	wing Review, PTO-948. is □ approve	ed □ disapproved.
Application Papers  See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dragon The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are ob The drawing(s) filed on is/are ob The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	wing Review, PTO-948. is □ approve pjected to by the Examine	ed □ disapproved.
Application Papers  ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drage ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	wing Review, PTO-948. is □ approve pjected to by the Examine	ed □ disapproved.
Application Papers  See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drag The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are ob The drawing(s) filed on is/are ob The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine  Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)	wing Review, PTO-948 is ☐ approve pjected to by the Examinate.	ed □ disapproved. er.
Application Papers  See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draged The proposed drawing correction, filed on	wing Review, PTO-948 is ☐ approve ojected to by the Examine r. y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9	ed □ disapproved. er.  (a)-(d).
Application Papers  See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drager The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are ob The drawing(s) filed on is/are ob The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies received.	wing Review, PTO-948 is approve pjected to by the Examinate.  r.  y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9 of the priority document	ed □ disapproved. er.  (a)-(d). s have been
Application Papers  See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draged The proposed drawing correction, filed on	wing Review, PTO-948 is approve pjected to by the Examinate.  r.  y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9 of the priority document	ed □ disapproved. er.  (a)-(d). s have been
Application Papers  See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dragery The proposed drawing correction, filed on	wing Review, PTO-948 is approve pjected to by the Examination at the priority document approve the priority document	ed □ disapproved. er.  (a)-(d). es have been  CT Rule 1 7.2(a)).
Application Papers  □ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drage The proposed drawing correction, filed on	wing Review, PTO-948 is approve pjected to by the Examination at the priority document approve the priority document	ed □ disapproved. er.  (a)-(d). es have been  CT Rule 1 7.2(a)).
Application Papers  □ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dragery □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	wing Review, PTO-948 is approve pjected to by the Examinator.  y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9 of the priority document mber) International Bureau (PC	ed □ disapproved. er.  (a)-(d). es have been  CT Rule 1 7.2(a)).
Application Papers  See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draged The proposed drawing correction, filed on	wing Review, PTO-948.  is approve a piected to by the Examination and Bureau (PC) approve a piected to by the Examination and Bureau (PC) approved the priority document and Bureau (PC) approved the priority approved the priority document approved t	ed □ disapproved. er.  (a)-(d). s have been  CT Rule 1 7.2(a)).

Application/Control Number: 09/778,973 Page 2

Art Unit: 3617

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Although the claims of the present application contain common subject matter with parent application 09/152,377, and Double Patenting is believed present, such parent application is unavailable to the examiner, and therefore a determination of Double Patenting cannot be made at this time. In the interest of compact prosecution, Applicant is urged to file a Terminal Disclaimer in response to this action.

2. Claims 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 22,24,26 and 28 are improper Markush type claims, in that since the claimed elements of the group fail to "share a common utility" and fail "to share a substantial structural feature disclosed as being essential to that utility".

3. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: claims 22-25 drawn to a boat accessory, and claims 26-29 drawn to a floatation device.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, there are no generic claims.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon,

Application/Control Number: 09/778,973 Page 3

Art Unit: 3617

including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

- 4. Papers relating to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 3600 by facsimile transmission. The submission of such papers by facsimile transmission must comply with the notice published in the Official Gazette, **1096 OG 30** (November 15, 1989). The Fax Center number is (703)-305-7687.
- 5. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Ed L. Swinehart whose telephone number is (703)-308-2566.
- 6. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center 3600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-308-1113.

June 4, 2001

Ed L. Swinehart Primary Examiner Art Unit 3617